REMARKS

Claims 1-18 and 21-31 were pending in the application. Claims 2, 4-5, and 23-24 stand objected to. Claims 1, 3, 4-18, 21-22, and 25-31 stand rejected. Claim 1 was cancelled. Claims 2-7, 17, 21, 23-24, and 26 were amended. Claims 32-36 were added. Claims 2-36 remain in the application.

Claims 2, 4-5, and 23-24 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Each of 2 and 4-5, and 23-24 has been rewritten as an independent claim using language similar to Claims 1 and 21, respectively.

In all of Claims 2, 4-5, and 23-24, the term "digitized image" has been replaced by the term "digital image". This change is broadening and is supported by the application as filed, notably at page 7, lines 24-26.

The remaining claims were amended on the same basis, as necessary, to change "digitized image" to "digital image".

Claims 7-16, 18, and 26-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C: 112, second paragraph. The rejection stated:

> "Claim 26 (requirement "e") recites the limitation "... to produce enhanced value imaging services and products for image groups that fall into an appropriate semantic theme." It is unclear what the enhanced value imaging *service and products* (emphasis added) suppose to include specifically. A similar limitation also occurs in claim 7. Please clarify.
>
> "Since claims 8-16 and 27-31 depend on claims 7 and 26 respectively, they are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for the same reason set forth above for claims 7 and 26."

Claim 7 was amended by removing the language:

> "to produce enhanced value imaging services and products for image groups that fall into an appropriate semantic theme"

and

> "to generate themed imaging services appropriate for the selected semantic classification".

Claim 26 was amended to change the last section to:

"(e) a plurality of semantic theme processors, one for each semantic classification, said semantic theme processor of the selected semantic classification processing said group of images."

Claims 1, 3, 6, 17, 21-22, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mojsilovic, et al. (Pre-grant Publication US 2003/0123737). The rejection stated:

> "With regard to claim 21, Mojsilovic, et al. discloses a system for organizing and categorizing images by semantic content (See for example, paragraph 0030, lines 3-5), comprising: (a) an image feature extractor that extracts one or more image feature measurements, i.e., perceptual features of the image, from ach of the digitized images in an image group (See for example, paragraph 0014, line 22-24); (b) an image semantic classifier, i.e., semantic category, that uses the one or more image feature measurements to produce an individual image confidence measure, that an individual image belongs to one or more semantic classifications, i.e., perceptually based metric, wherein the metric computes the similarity between the features used to describe the semantic category, whereby said image semantic classifier produces the individual image confidence measures, i.e., highest value of the similarity measure, for a plurality of the digitized images in an image group, (c) an image group semantic classifier that uses the individual image confidence measures for the images in the image group to produce an image group confidence measure that the image group belongs to one or more semantic classifications; and (d) a decision module that uses the image group confidence measure to decide whether the image group belongs to a selected one or to none of the semantic classifications, whereby the selected semantic classification constitutes the general semantic theme of the group of images (see paragraph 0014, lines 24-26; paragraph 0015, lines 5-9; paragraph 0045, lines 11-13; paragraph 0046, lines 1-13; and the abstract lines 13-25). Thus, given the broadest reasonable interpretation, Mojsilovic, et al. does meet requirements (a-d) of claim 1.
>
> "With regard to claim 22, the system as claimed in clam 21 wherein the image feature extractor extracts at least one feature selected from the group consisting of a face, a standing person, a gender or age

characteristic of a person, a color histogram, a texture measure, and image spectral information (See for example, paragraphs 0066-0070).

"With regard to claim 25, the system as claimed in claim 21 wherein the decision module processes a plurality of image group confidence measures relating to an image group and makes a mutually exclusive decision that the image group belongs to a specific one or to none of the semantic classifications (See for example, paragraph 0045, lines 12-13).

"Claim 1 is rejected the same as claim 21 except claim 1 is a method claim. Thus, argument analogous to that presented above for claim 21 is applicable to claim 1.

"Claim 3 is rejected the same as claim 22 except claim 3 is a method claim. Thus, argument analogous to that presented above for claim 22 is applicable to claim 3.

"Claim 6 is rejected the same as claim 25 except claim 6 is a method claim. Thus, argument analogous to that presented above for claim 25 is applicable to claim 6.

"With regard to claim 17, a computer storage medium having instructions stored therein for causing a computer to perform the method of claim 1 (See for example, item 403, in Fig. 1)."

Claim 1 was cancelled.

Claims 2, 6, and 17 were amended to depend from Claim 2 and are allowable on that basis.

Claim 21 was amended to state:

21. A system for determining the general semantic theme of a group of digital images, whereby each digital image is identified as belonging to a specific group of images, said system comprising:

(a) an image feature extractor that extracts one or more image feature measurements from each of the digital images in an image group;

(b) an image semantic classifier that uses the one or more image feature measurements to produce an individual image confidence measure that an individual image belongs to one or more semantic classifications, whereby said image semantic classifier produces the

individual image confidence measures for a plurality of the digital images in an image group;

(c) an image group semantic classifier that uses the individual image confidence measures for the images in the image group to produce an image group confidence measure that the image group belongs to one or more semantic classifications; and

(d) a decision module that uses the image group confidence measure to decide whether the image group belongs to a selected one or to none of the semantic classifications, whereby the selected semantic classification constitutes the general semantic theme of the group of images and that routes the group of images to further processing responsive to the selected semantic classification.

Claim 21 is supported by the application as filed, notably the original claims and at page 10, lines 7-13.

Claim 21 requires a decision module that decides the selected semantic classification and that routes the group of images to further processing responsive to the selected semantic classification.

Claims 22 and 25 are allowable as depending from Claim 21.

Added Claim 32 states:

32. A method for determining the general semantic theme of a group of images, said method comprising the steps of:

providing a group of digital images, each said digital image being identified as belonging to said group;

extracting one or more image feature measurements from each of a plurality of said digital images in said image group;

producing a set of individual image confidence measures from said image feature measurements of each of said digital images of said plurality, each said image confidence measure indicating a confidence that the individual image belongs to a respective one of a plurality of semantic classifications;

generating a set of image group confidence measures from said individual image confidence measures of said plurality of digital images, each said image group confidence measure indicating a

confidence that said image group belongs to a respective one of said semantic classifications;

deciding whether said image group belongs to one or none of said semantic classifications based upon said image group confidence measures to provide a classification decision; and

processing each of said digital images of said group in accordance with said classification decision.

Claim 32 is supported by the application as filed, notably the original claims.

Claim 32 requires processing each of the digital images in the group in accordance with the classification decision for the group. This is unlike the cited reference.

Claims 33-36 are allowable as depending from Claim 32.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 30,700

Robert Luke Walker/amb
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 588-2739
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148